



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

m-H.

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 10/084,631 | 02/27/2002 | Woon Shing Tai | 47774/MEG/C990 | 3687 |
| 23363 | 7590 | 08/13/2003 | | |
| CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP 350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD SUITE 500 PASADENA, CA 91105 | | | EXAMINER LEGESSE, NINI F | |
| | | | ART UNIT 3711 | PAPER NUMBER |

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(S)

| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | 10/084,631 | TAI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Nini F. Legesse | 3711 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nini F. Legesse. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Rodney Warford. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 August 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 3,806,133 to Cok, US 5,273,284 to Montgomery, US 5,776,007 to Kendall, US 6,048,273 to Clement.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Paul T. Scovil
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the course of the interview, the rejection to claims 1-23 were discussed as they relate to the prior art of record. Mr. Warfford explained how the invention functions differently than the applied prior art of record (Patent No. 3,806,133 to Cork). Mr. Warfford argued that the Cork reference fails to teach wherein the alignment members are vertically aligned. However, examiner has indicated that the alignment members (items 6) are clearly vertically aligned as shown on Figure 1 and also indicated that the lower alignment member is adjustable. Mr. Warfford discussed his intension of adding a limitation in claim 1 that indicates the lower alignment member to be non-adjustable. Examiner indicated to Mr. Warfford that if he modified his claim to make the lower alignment member non-adjustable, it will result the 102 rejection to be changed to a 103 rejection. Examiner has notified Mr. Warfford that the claims have another 103 rejection with the Clement reference in view of Montgomery (US 5,273,284). Examiner discussed that Fig. 7 and column 4, lines 25-35 of the Montgomery reference teaches the use of vertical sighting alignment members that are used to practice putting that serve similar purpose as his invention's. With respect to claims 8 and 9 Examiner has clarified to Applicant that Kendall (US 5,776,007) discloses supports (49,50) that are bowed downwardly towards the putting surface. In addition, applicant is informed that any amendment and argument that Applicant would provide in response to the office action would be considered upon submission. .